



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,402	04/23/2001	Robert D. Kluser	7201 US	6386

7590 07/01/2003

Francis I. Gray
MS 50-LAW
TEKTRONIX, INC.
P.O. Box 500
Beaverton, OR 97077

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ANDERSON, GERALD A

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3637

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/841,402	KLUSER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JERRY A ANDERSON	3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 17 April 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Eriksson does not teach a frame and a sleeve. The applicant may be misinterpreting Erickson. The Examiner considers the cubicles 1a-d of Erickson to be equivalent to the frames of claim 1. Each cubicle has at least a central compartment and Figure 2 clearly shows a sleeve with a door and electrical components separate from the cubicle or frame, which can slide into the compartment in the cubicle or frame. The applicant argues that Jeffries does not teach spring elements of a latch systems mounted on sides of a rigid frame securing the sleeve. The applicant is corrected. Noda has replaced Jeffries.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. This claim is redundant. It is the same as claim 5 and 5 is dependent on claim 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Noda. Noda is cited showing a frame 24, 26, 30 having a compartment 32, a spring 88 is mounted on the frame with a button 94 through a hole in the frame 96 securing a sleeve 22 to the frame.

Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eriksson et al in view of Noda and Saunders et al. Eriksson is cited showing a modular rack-mounting system having a frame or cubicle 1b with a sleeve inserted into

a compartment in Figure 2, immediately above this compartment is another compartment with a central rib defining two compartments each mounting a sleeve. Eriksson fails to show a spring mounted button in a hole or a frame having two parts that are press fitted and maybe welded. This is an application claims the invention as an apparatus. Thus the steps or way in which the frame is formed carries no weight. It is the product alone that must be patentable distinguished from the prior art. Noda is cited showing a latching system for retaining a modular sleeve for an electrical device in a support structure. It is well settled that to make integral parts separable is an obvious matter of design choice for one having an ordinary skill in the art. Saunders is cited showing that it is well known to assemble an electrical device support frame from parts that mesh when assembled. The frame has means of securing the sleeve to the frame having spring mounted buttons engaging holes. Since the references are from the same field of endeavor the purpose of Noda and Saunders would have been obvious in the pertinent art of Eriksson at the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to have modified Eriksson with spring mounted buttons in holes in the frame providing a means of securing a sleeve to the frame in view of Noda and with a parts which mesh providing a frame in view of the ordinary skill of one versed in the art and the teaching of Saunders.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3637

This action is not Final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerry Anderson whose telephone number is 703 038 2202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 703 308 24668. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305 3597 for regular communications and 703 306 4195 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 2197.

Jaa
June 27, 2003



GERALD B. A. ANDERSON
PATENT EXAMINER